

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed 07/17/2007. Claims 1-10, 12-24, and 26-35 are pending in this application. This Amendment amends claims 1, 15, 29, 30, and 35. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant-Initiated Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for granting an interview dated 9/17/2007, where arguments were discussed generally. The Examiner expressed a need for the claims to expand on the terms "strict" or "non-strict." The amended claims address these concerns.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 12-17, 19, 22-24 and 26-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Maslov* (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,673) (hereinafter "*Maslov*"). Applicants respectfully submit that *Maslov* does not disclose each element of the amended claims.

For example, Applicants' claim 1, as amended, recites a method for monitoring multiple online resources in different formats, the method comprising the steps of:

identifying a plurality of online resources to monitor, the plurality of online resources being stored in a plurality of formats, at least one of the plurality of online resources including data in a non-strict architectural structure;

converting each of the plurality of online resources to a strict formatted file having a common format, wherein data in the plurality of formats of the plurality of online resources is converted into a strict architectural structure which places constraints on the structural location of content identifiers and flags in the respective strict formatted file;

after converting to the strict formatted file, identifying relevant data in each of the strict formatted files based on the strict architectural structure of the data using an analytic parser; and comparing the identified relevant data in at least one of the strict formatted files to a most recent archived copy of the identified relevant data to determine whether the identified relevant data has been altered. (emphasis added).

Such limitations are not disclosed by *Maslov*.

Maslov discloses the extraction of digests of structured online documents, and automatic monitoring of the digests. *Maslov* also discloses that techniques are used to synthesize lower level document presentation from the higher level document presentation, such as the

XSLT language that is used to write programs that transform XML documents to HTML documents that are rendered in a web browser. (*Maslov*, col. 3, lines 25-40). A script that performs online document transformation according to this invention (also called WebTransformer Script) is created. This sample script transforms the source document 10 at FIG.2 to the target document 40. ***Maslov* discloses how the transformation is performed. First user selects a source document fragment using a pointing device and selects the "Copy" command. When the "Copy" command is selected, the transformation **script downloads the source document and transforms its fragment into the fragment in the target document.**** (*Maslov*, col. 8, lines 30-67). Moreover, to be able to find the user-selected fragment of the changed source online document, the document model is used in the script. (*Maslov*, col. 10, lines 26-28). The script includes a sequence of "Go To Child" commands that goes from the downloaded treeroot to the document tree node that represents the document fragment selected by the user. (*Maslov*, col. 9, lines 1-5).

Although *Maslov* discloses using XSLT to write programs that transform XML documents to HTML documents, *Maslov* does not disclose converting each of the plurality of online resources to a strict formatted file having a common format, wherein data in the plurality of formats of the plurality of online resources is converted into **a strict architectural structure which places constraints on the structural location of content identifiers and flags** in the respective strict formatted file, as is recited by claim 1. It should be noted that *Maslov* only mentions transformation from a higher level abstract (XML) to lower level (HTML), and does not mention HTML to XML transformations, as suggested in the office action. HTML documents impart structure to content in that the content can be represented by a tree using various tags (*Maslov*, col. 4, lines 49-52), however these HTML documents are not in a strict architectural structure. There is no mention of imposing limitations on the structural location of the HTML tags. Instead, the HTML format allows various location-based arrangements of identifiers or flags within the body of an HTML source code. Thus, *Maslov* does not disclose the feature of "converting" as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, although *Maslov* discloses the monitoring of the HTML, XML, and SGML documents and transforming the document fragment in a target window, *Maslov* does not disclose "**after converting to the strict formatted file, identifying relevant data in each of the strict formatted files**" based on the strict architectural structure of the data in the strict formatted files using an analytic parser," as recited in claim 1. It is asserted in the office action that the transformation of a source document to a target document, as taught by *Maslov*, discloses the feature of "converting...to a strict formatted file," as is recited in claim 1. For purposes of argument, even if the target document is read as disclosing the strict formatted document as a result of the conversion, the transformation is completed when the script copies the user-selected source document fragment to the target document. (*Maslov*, col. 9, lines 23-25). There is no processing that occurs on the target document **after the target document has been created**. The office action asserts that "the target window contains a converted data that is re-selected causing automatic creation of the digest of the converted and changed data." (Office Action, p. 8, item 6). It should be noted that the target window containing the converted data is not re-selected. When the script is run again, the script is executed on a fresh download of the source document and navigates through the source document tree to the user-selected fragment. (*Maslov*, col. 6, lines 5-13). Thus, locating a fragment in a fresh download of a source document does not amount to **identifying relevant data in each of the strict formatted files**, as recited in claim 1.

Thus, *Maslov* does not disclose "converting each of the plurality of online resources to a strict formatted file having a common format, wherein data in the plurality of formats of the plurality of online resources is converted into a strict architectural structure which places constraints on the structural location of content identifiers and flags in the respective strict formatted file, and after converting to the strict formatted file, identifying relevant data in each of the strict formatted files based on the strict architectural structure of the data in the strict formatted files using an analytic parser," as recited in claim 1. As such, *Maslov* cannot anticipate Applicants' claim 1, or the claims that depend therefrom. Independent claims 15, 29, 30, and 35 recite limitations that similarly are not taught by *Maslov*. Thus, *Maslov* cannot anticipate claims

15, 29, 30, and 35 or the claims that depend therefrom. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn with respect to these claims.

Claim 29

Applicants respectfully submit that *Maslov* does not disclose each element of the amended claims. For example, Applicants' claim 29, as amended, recites in part,

remotely updating the relevant data in the database online resource by using a script which updates the relevant data in at least one of the strict formatted files converted from the database online resource and by converting the at least one strict formatted file to an original format of the database online resource. (*emphasis added*).

Although *Maslov* discloses the process of source document transformation into a target document by document digest creation, Figure 6 merely describes this same process being performed in a client-server setup. (*Maslov*, col. 11, lines 4-39). There is no mention of "remotely updating the relevant data in the database online resource," as recited in claim 29. As such, *Maslov* cannot anticipate Applicants' claim 29, or the claims that depend therefrom.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4, 6, 7, 18, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Maslov* and further in view of *Helgeson et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,643,652) (hereinafter "*Helgeson*"). Claims 4, 6, 7, 18, 20 and 21 depend from claims 1 or 15, which as discussed above are not rendered obvious by *Maslov*. *Helgeson* does not make up for the deficiencies in *Maslov* with respect to claims 1 or 15.

Helgeson teaches mapping between a specific local format and a generic interchange format (col. 2, lines 51-67). *Helgeson* is cited as teaching "converting from the non-hypertext markup language application to a hypertext markup language application" (Office Action, p. 6). *Helgeson* does not suggest, however, **after converting to the strict formatted file, identifying relevant data in each of the strict formatted files** based on the strict architectural structure of the data in the strict formatted files using an analytic parser, as required by Applicants' claims 1 and 15. Neither does *Helgeson* nor *Maslov* provide motivation for providing such functionality,

and even if the references were combined for sake of argument the result would not arrive at the invention recited in Applicants' claim 1.

As *Maslov* and *Helgeson* fail to teach or suggest the elements of these claims, claims 1 and 15 cannot be rendered obvious by *Maslov* and *Helgeson* either alone or in combination. As claims 4, 6, 7, 18, 20, and 21 depend from claims 1 or 15, neither can these claims be rendered obvious. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection with respect to claims 4, 6, 7, 18, 20, and 21 be withdrawn.

III. Amendment to the Claims

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof. The amendments are supported by the specification and do not add new matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,
/ Naya Chatterjee-Marathe/

Naya Chatterjee-Marathe
Reg. No. 54,680

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
NMC:pas
61127936 v1